



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,843	05/01/2001	Noboru Ogino	01269-LH	7322
1933	7590	11/16/2004	EXAMINER	
FRISHAUF, HOLTZ, GOODMAN & CHICK, PC 767 THIRD AVENUE 25TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10017-2023			THOMPSON, JAMES A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/847,843

Applicant(s)

OGINO, NOBORU

Examiner

James A Thompson

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 May 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 3 is objected to because claim 3 includes reference characters which are not enclosed within parentheses.

Reference characters corresponding to elements recited in the detailed description of the drawings and used in conjunction with the recitation of the same element or group of elements in the claims should be enclosed within parentheses so as to avoid confusion with other numbers or characters which may appear in the claims. See MPEP § 608.01(m).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US Patent 6,118,972) in view of Nishida (US Patent 5,961,226).

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claim 1: Yamazaki discloses a document reading device (figure 3 of Yamazaki) comprising a reading unit (figure 3(3) of Yamazaki) for reading an image of a document (column 8, lines 44-49 of Yamazaki); a document size detector (figure 3(S1) of Yamazaki) for detecting a size of the document (column 7, lines 15-20 of Yamazaki); and a controller (figure 3(80) of Yamazaki) for controlling said reading unit to read the image of the document in a read size corresponding to the document size (column 10, lines 5-12 of Yamazaki) confirmed from a detection result of said document size detector (column 9, line 63 to column 10, line 5 of Yamazaki), wherein said controller includes a user interface (figure 3(80("switches, numeral keys, and a liquid crystal touch panel")) of Yamazaki) for inputting various information (column 6, lines 20-24 of Yamazaki). Yamazaki teaches that a user interface comprising switches, numeral keys, and a liquid crystal touch panel are a part of said controller (column 6, lines 20-24 of Yamazaki), though not specifically shown in figure 3 of Yamazaki.

Yamazaki does not disclose expressly that said user interface is used for outputting various information; and that said controller includes read size specifying means for requesting designation of a document size via said user interface when the document size is not confirmable from a detection result of the document size detector and specifying the read size corresponding to the document size which is designated via said user interface according to the request.

Nishida discloses a user interface (figure 2(12,13) of Nishida) for inputting and outputting various information (column 3, lines 1-4 of Nishida). The keyboard (figure 2(12) of Nishida) and the crystal display (figure 2(13) of Nishida)

Art Unit: 2624

constitute a user interface since both, in combination, are used to input and output relevant information (column 3, lines 1-4 of Nishida); and read size specifying means (figure 2(6) and column 3, lines 22-26 of Nishida) for requesting designation of a document size via said user interface (column 4, lines 53-57 of Nishida) when the document size is not confirmable from a detection result of a document size detector (column 4, lines 49-53 of Nishida) and specifying the read size corresponding to the document size which is designated via said user interface according to the request (column 4, lines 57-61 of Nishida).

Yamazaki and Nishida are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely document size detection, document processing, and document printing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a user interface that allows the user to specify a document size and a read size if the document size is not recognized by the system, as taught by Nishida, wherein said document size detection is performed by the document size detector taught by Yamazaki. The motivation for doing so would have been that, if the document size cannot be determined by the system, a user should be able to input the data into the system, thus allowing the document processing to occur (column 4, lines 53-61 of Nishida). Otherwise, the system will not be able to process documents that are not a standard size. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Nishida with Yamazaki to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

5. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki (US Patent 6,118,972) in view of Nishida (US Patent 5,961,226) and Tanaka (US Patent 5,973,797).

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claim 2: Yamazaki in view of Nishida does not disclose expressly that said reading unit includes a document table for supporting a single document placed thereon and a cover capable of being opened and closed, and said read size specifying means is constructed such that the document size designated via said user interface is confirmed in a state where said cover is closed, and the document size is maintained until said cover is opened.

Tanaka discloses a document table (figure 1(16) of Tanaka) for supporting a single document placed thereon (column 7, lines 35-38 of Tanaka) and a cover (figure 1(24) of Tanaka) capable of being opened and closed (column 7, lines 57-62 of Tanaka), and that the document size is confirmed in a state where said cover is closed, and the document size is maintained until said cover is opened (column 18, lines 58-60 of Tanaka). The existence of a document (column 18, lines 52-57 of Tanaka) and the document size is only determined when the platen is in a closed state (column 18, lines 58-60 of Tanaka). Therefore, the detected document size is maintained until said cover is opened.

Yamazaki in view of Nishida is combinable with Tanaka because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely document size detection, document processing, and document printing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the document table and the cover taught by Tanaka as part of the overall reading unit and, when the read size specifying means designates a size via a user interface, as taught by Nishida, the document size is confirmed (determined) in a state where said cover is closed, as taught by Tanaka. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to accurately determine the

Art Unit: 2624

document size, regardless of the background color of the document (column 6, lines 11-20 of Tanaka). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tanaka with Yamazaki in view of Nishida to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

Regarding claim 3: Yamazaki discloses a document feeder (figure 1(2) of Yamazaki) for feeding a plurality of documents (column 6, lines 25-33 of Yamazaki).

Yamazaki does not disclose expressly that said reading unit is capable of reading an image of the other document fed by the document feeder while maintaining the document on the document table; and said read size specifying means is constructed such that the read size for the document fed by the document feeder is independently specified from the read size for the document on said document table to maintain the document size designated for the document on the document table until the cover is opened.

Nishida discloses that the read size for the document fed by a document feeder is independently specified by the user (column 4, lines 50-57 of Nishida) to maintain the document size designated for all scanning and printing (column 4, lines 57-61 of Nishida).

Yamazaki and Nishida are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely document size detection, document processing, and document printing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the same independently specified document size for all the document images processed, as taught by Nishida. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to process the plurality of document images faster (column

Art Unit: 2624

10, lines 5-9 and lines 12-17 of Yamazaki). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Nishida with Yamazaki.

Yamazaki in view of Nishida does not disclose expressly that said reading unit is capable of reading an image of the other document fed by the document feeder while maintaining the document on the document table; and that said independently specified read size is specified from the read size for the document on said document table until the cover is opened.

Tanaka discloses reading a document on said document table and determining the document size (column 18, lines 52-57 of Tanaka); and specifying a read size from the read size for the document on said document table until the cover is opened (column 18, lines 58-60 of Tanaka).

Yamazaki in view of Nishida is combinable with Tanaka because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely document size detection, document processing, and document printing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the read size determined for the document on said document table, as taught by Tanaka, as the read size for all of the document images to be read and processed, as taught by Nishida, since Nishida teaches that, when a document size is specifically determined, said document size is used for processing the document images (column 4, lines 42-46 and lines 57-61 of Nishida). The read size determined by the document table taught by Tanaka is simply used as the input. The motivation for doing so would have been that, by setting all the document sizes to a predetermined size (column 10, lines 5-9 of Yamazaki), the document image processing can be performed faster (column 10, lines 12-17 of Yamazaki). Further, since the document table

Art Unit: 2624

taught by Tanaka is included as part of the reading unit taught by Yamazaki, and is thus separate from the document feeder taught by Yamazaki, then said document feeder feeds documents other than the document on said document table and said reading unit is capable of reading an image of the other document fed by the document feeder while maintaining the document on the document table. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tanaka with Yamazaki in view of Nishida to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A Thompson whose telephone number is 703-305-6329. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on 703-308-7452. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/847,843

Page 9

Art Unit: 2624

James A. Thompson
Examiner
Art Unit 2624

JAT
10 November 2004



THOMPSON
~~THOMPSON~~ LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER